## 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 3 4 DEDRIC LEE WILEY, Case No. 1:14-cv-02093-SMS HC 5 Petitioner, ORDER TRANSFERRING THIS CASE TO 6 v. THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 7 PAUL COPENHAVER, WARDEN, 8 Respondent. 9 10 On December 31, 2014, Petitioner Dedric Lee Wiley filed this pro se petition for writ of 11 habeas corpus in this Court, alleging that his federal constitutional rights were violated by errors in 12 disciplinary proceedings at the United States Prison-Atwater, California, where he was then 13 confined. On March 3, 2015, Petitioner advised the Clerk of Court that he had moved to the United 14 States Prison-Victorville, California. 15 A habeas action is subject to jurisdictional and statutory limitations. See Braden v. 30<sup>th</sup> 16 Judicial Circuit Court of Kentucky, 410 U.S. 484 (1973). The proper respondent in a habeas corpus 17 action is the warden of the institution in which the petitioner is confined. Rumsfield v. Padilla, 542 18 U.S. 426, 434 (2004). In this case, following Petitioner's recent transfer, the proper respondent is the 19 Warden of the United States Prison-Victorville, California. Because the habeas petition must be 20 reviewed by the district court in the district where the petitioner is confined (*United States v.* 21 Giddings, 740 F.2d 770, 772 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1984)), this Court must transfer the petition to the District 22 Court for Central District of California. 23 Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS that this case be TRANSFERRED to the United 24 States District Court for the Central District of California. 25 IT IS SO ORDERED. 26 27 March 5, 2015 /s/ Sandra M. Snyder Dated:

28

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE